

## **DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

### **SUSPENSION OF SIX MONTHS AND A DAY - Mark D. Sisk Supreme Court No. 346, 2012. Effective Date: September 25, 2012**

By order dated September 25, 2012, the Supreme Court of Delaware suspended Mark D. Sisk from the practice of law in Delaware for six months and a day for violations of the Delaware Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct ("Rules"). The Court approved the findings of violations made by the Board on Professional Responsibility (the "Board"), and ordered the sanction of suspension. The Board concluded that in connection with three client matters Respondent (1) failed to provide competent (**Rule 1.1**) and diligent representation (**Rule 1.3**), failed to abide by a client's directive to file child support petitions (**Rule 1.2(a)**), failed to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter (**Rule 1.4(a)(3)**), and engaged in conduct involving dishonesty (**Rule 8.4(c)**) when he told the client he had filed child support petitions, subsequently learned he had not filed them, and did not inform the client he had not filed the petitions; (2) failed to provide competent (**Rule 1.1**) and diligent representation (**Rule 1.3**), and abide by a client's directive (**Rule 1.2(a)**), when he took more than five years to complete a qualified domestic relations order; (3) failed to abide by a client's directive (**Rule 1.2(a)**) and act with diligence (**Rule 1.3**) when he did not timely convey a settlement offer; (4) failed to keep his client reasonably informed (**Rule 1.4(a)(3)**) and respond to reasonable requests for information (**Rule 1.4(a)(4)**) during the more than five years it took to complete the qualified domestic relations order; (5) failed to comply with a

client's reasonable requests for information in connection with the status of a real estate settlement matter (**Rule 1.4(a)(4)**); and (6) failed to promptly refund a client's retainer upon termination of representation (**Rule 1.16(d)**). The Board also concluded Respondent knowingly failed to respond to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel's lawful demand for information (**Rule 8.1(b)**).

The Supreme Court, which concluded Respondent's violations were knowing, considered the mitigating factors of Respondent's personal illness, death of a parent, and dissolution of his law firm. The Supreme Court ordered Respondent suspended from the practice of law for six months and a day.